REMARKS

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors.

Claim 21 has been amended to address an objection made by the Office that "it is hard to distinguish the preamble from the body of the claim".

Claims 1, 12, 21, 23, 25, and 26 have been amended.

Claims 2, 3, and 13 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1, and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,577,907 to Czyszczewski et al (Czyszczewski).

Claims 2, and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0075506 to Stevenson et al (Stevenson).

Claims 1, 4-12, 14-27 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,577,907 to Czyszczewski et al (Czyszczewski).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of claims 2 and 3. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled.

Claim 2 (and claims 11-27) is currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0075506 to Stevenson et al (Stevenson).

Since amended claim 1 includes the elements of claim 2 and 3, currently amended claim 1, claims 4-11 and claims 11-27 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of Stevenson.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 recites

A method for providing access from a multifunction device to data operatively associated with a user-specified remote storage device, comprising:

identifying said user-specified remote storage device based at least in part on a path thereto specified by a user at said multifunction device;

establishing a link between said multifunction device and the user-specified remote storage device having said data operatively associated therewith; and

accessing said data operatively associated with said user-specified remote storage device from said multifunction device over said link established therebetween.

Czyszczewski generally is directed to multifunction devices (MFD) that are connected to modular middleware services, such as databases over a network (col. 2, lines 3-6 of Czyszczewski). MFDs may access a set of global services over a communications network or may incorporate services locally (col. 2, lines 57-61 of Czyszczewski). The accessing of such services is performed by having the services routed directly to the MFD by identifying the unique network address of the MFD (col. 6, lines 43-49 of Czyszczewski). Czyszczewski relies on a predetermination and knowledge of network addresses, specifically network addresses of MFDs receiving services. Czyszczewski does not discuss network addresses of services (e.g., databases) that may be identified by MFDs and specified by a user.

Stevenson generally is directed to printers that receive print jobs from an authorized user. Users are authenticated (i.e., authorized/identified) by a third

party authentication server on a network connecting the printers and users. The authentication server authenticates users through a password provided by the users. Once the authentication server authenticates the user, the user is granted access to or the ability to print to a printer on the network (paragraphs 11 and 12 of Stevenson).

Amended independent claim 1 has been amended to include the element of original claim 2 which recites in part "identifying said user-specified remote storage device" and the element of claim 3 which recites "wherein identifying said user-specified remote storage device is based at least in part on a path thereto specified by a user at said multifunction device".

In rejecting original claim 2 the Office admits in the present office action that Czyszczewski does not teach "identifying said user-specified remote storage device", and relies on Stevenson as teaching this element. The Office particularly points to paragraphs 11 and 12 of Stevenson. These paragraphs, however, discuss using an authentication server to perform an identification of *users* such that authenticated users can to print to printers on a network. Stevenson does not discuss or suggest that a user might specify—"*at said multifunction device*"—a path to a remote storage device. Since Czyszczewski does not teach this claim element, and since the cited portion of Stevenson fails to teach such an element, the combination cannot fairly be said to render claim 1 obvious.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 4-11 depend from dependent claim 1 and for at least the same reasons in support of base claim 1 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 4-11 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 12 has been amended to include the element of original claim 13 which recites in part "identifying a remote storage device having said user-requested data operatively associated therewith based at least in part on a path for said remote storage device specified by a user at said configured multifunction device".

As discussed above in support of claim 1, the combination of Czyszczewski and Stevenson does not teach this identifying element. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 14-20 depend from dependent claim 12 and for at least the same reasons in support of base claim 12 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 14-20 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 21 recites in part "program code for identifying data operatively associated with a user-specified remote storage device". As discussed above in support of claim 1, the combination of Czyszczewski and Stevenson does not teach the identifying element. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 22-27 depend from dependent claim 21 and for at least the same reasons in support of base claim 21 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 22-27 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1, 4-12, 14-27 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6/23/04

By:

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245

14